

REMARKS

In the office action, claim 1, for example, was rejected under Section 103 as being unpatentable over Yanagisawa in view of van Bokhorst. It is noted in the office action that Yanagisawa teaches that the WOL function is achieved by inserting a WOL capable LAN adapter card into a bus slot on the computer's main body.

Claim 1 calls for providing an add-in card "without a medium access control" to implement wireless communications. The importance of the "without a medium access control" limitation is explained in the present specification at page 10, line 3 through page 11, line 8. There, it is explained that since wake filtering is normally associated with the MAC function, this would mean that in order to test to determine whether or not a given packet is an appropriate wake packet, the entire system would have to be awoken. See page 10, lines 19-23.

The cited reference to Yanagisawa is silent on whether or not the LAN adapter card has or does not have a medium access control. However, Yanagisawa, in column 13, lines 30-34, indicates that the wake-up on LAN function is described better in U.S. Patent 5,404,544. Note that it is the wake-up on LAN function which the Applicant, in the present specification, indicated must include the medium access control. See the present specification at page 10, lines 3-7.

The proposition that the wake-up on LAN function uses the medium access control is substantiated by referring to the patent referred to in Yanagisawa where it is explicitly explained that the awake feature is part of the MAC 30. See U.S. Patent 5,404,544 at column 3, lines 59-65.

Thus, the cited reference teaches away from the claimed limitation and essentially amounts to the previous art, noted in the present specification, which is clearly distinguishable.

Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of the claims is respectfully requested.

Claim 7 calls for the wake packet filtering function to be removed from the medium access control. Claim 12 calls for the medium access control to not include wake packet filtering functions.


Thus, these claims are all distinguished on the same basis. In claim 13, the add-in card is a different element from the medium access control. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 15 is requested.

Claim 17 effectively calls for the same thing since it says that if the packet is one that necessitates waking the platform to provide a signal from said system to the platform to wake the platform. Thus, the MAC and the wake packet filtering are separated.

In view of these remarks, the application should now be in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 23, 2006



Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750
Houston, TX 77057-2631
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation